

1

2

3

4

5

6 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

7

8 WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2006

9 ALTADENA COMMUNITY CENTER

10 730 EAST ALTADENA DRIVE

11 ALTADENA, CALIFORNIA, 91001

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 APPEARANCES:

2 STEVE SLATEN - NASA

3 MERRILEE FELLOWS - NASA, MANAGER OF OUTREACH

4 MARK RIPPERDA - USEPA

5 GARY TAKARA - PASADENA WATER & POWER

6 BRAD BOMAN - PASADENA WATER & POWER

7 KEITH FIELDS - BATTELLE

8 LORI GARNER - BATTELLE

9 SUSAN SANTOS - FOCUS GROUP

10 BURT PERETSKI - FOCUS GROUP

11 MYRNA GUTIERREZ - MYRNA GUTIERREZ ASSOCIATES

12 BOB HAYWARD - LINCOLN AVENUE WATER COMPANY

13 MOHAMMAD ZAIDI - L.A. REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

14 CELINA PAGANI-TOUSIGNANT - FOCUS GROUP

15 PHYLLIS CURRIE - PASADENA WATER AND POWER

16 JEFF O'KEEFE - CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

17 ALAN SORSHER - CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MS. FELLOWS: Welcome. It's nice to have everybody  
2 here tonight. I'm Merrilee Fellows. I'm manager of  
3 community involvement for NASA's Groundwater Cleanup  
4 Program. And first I would like to introduce Celina  
5 Pagani-Tousignant who will make some comments in Spanish  
6 for you Spanish speakers tonight.

7 MS. PAGANI-TOUSIGNANT: (Speaking in Spanish.)

8 MS. FELLOWS: Thanks, Celina. I also want to point  
9 out if you have friends who speak Spanish, that we have  
10 a proposed plan summary written in Spanish, it's  
11 available outside and on our web site and we will also  
12 accept comments submitted in Spanish.

13 Now I would like to introduce some local  
14 representatives and then introduce some people we may  
15 call on this evening during questions and answers.

16 First with the Altadena Town Council, Michele Zack  
17 is here, she's in the back. And Marietta Kruells is on  
18 the Land Use Committee for Altadena. Lena Kennedy is  
19 here, she's with Assemblywoman Carol Liu's office, there  
20 she is. And now I would like to recognize some  
21 participants this evening.

22 Steve Slaten is NASA's Groundwater Cleanup Program  
23 Remedial Project Manager. Steve is going to provide  
24 more technical details in a moment. We also have here  
25 tonight a number of consultants who helped us with these

1 very complex projects.

2 The Project Manager for Battelle is Keith Fields.

3 We have Susan Santos, Burt Peretsky, and Myrna Guterrez

4 who assist us in much of the community involvement work

5 along with Celina who you just spoke with.

6 The program to clean up groundwater also has three

7 agencies that exercise regulatory oversight. These

8 counterparts -- counterparts to Steve's job -- are

9 Mark Ripperda with US EPA, Environmental Protection

10 Agency; and Mohammad Zaidi is with the L.A. Regional

11 Water Quality Control. A third member is Michel

12 Iskarous who is not here tonight, he's with the

13 California Department of Toxic Substances Control. The

14 Department of Health Services regulates drinking water

15 quality in California and their representatives are also

16 here tonight, Jeff O'Keefe and Alan Sorsher. And most

17 importantly to the proposed plan we're discussing

18 tonight, the representatives of the two water purveyors,

19 Bob Hayward of Lincoln Avenue Water Company, General

20 Manager is here and from Pasadena Water and Power, we

21 have the General Manager Phyllis Currie and several

22 staff Brad Bowman and Gary Takara. And any others from

23 Pasadena and Water?

24 MS. CURRIE: How about quality managers in the back?

25 MS. FELLOWS: And the water quality managers, you

1 said?

2 MS. CURRIE: We're talking about our new engineer.

3 MS. FELLOWS: And Natalie, yeah. And Shan. So  
4 quite a few from there and most of them have a name tag,  
5 so if you have questions later, grab any one of us and  
6 we'll direct you to somebody that you can talk to.

7 Our approach to tonight's meeting is a little  
8 different. Most of you know the purpose tonight is to  
9 take your comments on NASA's proposed plan to continue  
10 funding the Lincoln Avenue Water Company Treatment Plant  
11 and to fund the construction and operation --

12 MR. SLATEN: Can we turn that off?

13 MS. FELLOWS: -- to fund construction and operation  
14 of a plant to remove -- it -- all you have to do is turn  
15 it on and off. To remove chemicals that have affected  
16 some Pasadena wells.

17 Just as we did for our November meeting, we have a  
18 court reporter here, Carrie, and she'll insure that  
19 what we -- we create what we call a public record and  
20 that is we capture all the public comments people make  
21 about the proposed plan and anything else you say  
22 tonight.

23 Before we get to those comments Steve is going to  
24 give a brief overview of the alternatives that were  
25 viewed and why NASA has selected the recommendation it

1 has as its preferred alternative. Then we'll take some  
2 questions for any clarifications you might have. And  
3 the key part of the evening is to take your formal  
4 comments about the proposed plan.

5 I also want to remind you that tonight is not your  
6 only chance to comment on the plan. The public comment  
7 period for written comments is open until May 19th. And  
8 after the public comment period closes we work in  
9 concert with the regulators to produce a  
10 record of decision, that documents the decision process in  
11 conclusions about the plan. Part of that document is  
12 called a responsiveness summary and that includes a  
13 summary of all the comments we received from you here  
14 tonight as well as the written ones in how we consider  
15 each of those comments in reaching our decision.

16 And also in addition to NASA's Proposed Plan,  
17 tonight's focus, the city will be holding a public  
18 hearing for a conditional use permit for the proposed site  
19 and an environmental review. The Department of Health  
20 Services also holds a public hearing much later in the  
21 process.

22 I wanted to mention the public comment cards are in  
23 sort of a hard card stock, Mary has some in the back.  
24 And if you want to make a comment and have -- submit it  
25 to me and I'll ask for you if you don't want to speak in

1 public, you can just write it down and if I can read  
2 your writing, I'll ask it. Or if you want to use this  
3 actually for a written comment for the formal proposed  
4 plan, you may write that on here and either hand it to  
5 us tonight or mail it into us later.

6 So now it's my -- my happy opportunity to introduce  
7 Steve to take over for us.

8 MR. SLATEN: Thanks.

9 MS. FELLOWS: Steve Slaten.

10 MR. SLATEN: Thanks, Merrilee.

11 MS. FELLOWS: Do you want to --

12 MR. SLATEN: You know, the -- the -- we're getting a  
13 lot of noise out of the mike so I am going to try to  
14 speak up. If it's not working then we'll try to use the  
15 mike again and there are more chairs further up towards  
16 the front if anybody wants to move up. So let me know  
17 if you are having any trouble hearing me at all.

18 As Merrilee said my name is Steve Slaten. I'm the  
19 Project Manager at NASA/JPL for the groundwater cleanup.  
20 I'm a hydrogeologist and environmental scientist working  
21 on this project for NASA.

22 And what I would like to -- to talk to you about  
23 tonight is about the project that NASA has, what NASA is  
24 proposing to do, what our technology is that we are  
25 proposing and why, what the location is and why we are

1 proposing this location, and then, of course, as  
2 Merrilee said to solicit your comments on our -- our  
3 proposed plan.

4 So, Keith, why don't we start with the first slide?

5 Just to get together to -- to help orient, the Jet  
6 Propulsion Laboratory is located over on the west side  
7 of the Arroyo Seco, and, of course, we have  
8 Altadena right next door across the Arroyo. And what I  
9 wanted to point out, we will be talking about tonight  
10 are the four City of Pasadena wells that are shut down,  
11 the Lincoln Avenue Water System, two wells, and a  
12 treatment facility which are working that we propose to  
13 continue funding.

14 And I wanted to try to get to the -- try to explain  
15 how the natural groundwater flow works in this area.  
16 And the natural groundwater flow is sort of generally  
17 away from the mountains where there is natural recharge  
18 where the -- the rain water and snow water soaks in and  
19 then it flows -- it sinks down into several hundred  
20 feet below the surface in what we call the aquifer and  
21 it moves slowly something like a foot a day towards the  
22 southeast underneath -- underneath JPL and sort of in  
23 the direction or downhill or towards -- towards the  
24 ocean.

25 And I'd like to kind of point out in general that



1 this is Windsor Avenue that we'll be talking along  
2 about a treatment plant proposal along Windsor Avenue,  
3 Lincoln Avenue going up through Altadena. This is  
4 Altadena Drive -- no, it's Loma Alta. Loma Alta Drive on  
5 the upper side on the north side of all of Altadena.

6 Next slide: This slide we're trying to show the big  
7 picture about what's occurred. And I'll just start at  
8 the beginning up on the left at the Jet Propulsion  
9 Laboratory. In the 1940s and 50s, there were -- when  
10 the army was operating the Jet Propulsion Laboratory,  
11 they used -- dug pits in the ground and used those pits  
12 for the disposal of liquid waste. They put liquid waste  
13 in those pits and it soaked into the ground. It was a  
14 common waste disposal method at the time and the type of  
15 waste that they put in there that we are now seeing in  
16 the groundwater, were things called volatile organic  
17 compounds, which are things like common cleaning  
18 solvents, degreasers that have been used at -- at  
19 automotive repair shops but they were used here to -- to  
20 clean off parts to degrease. Those volatile organic  
21 compounds are one of the chemicals or some of the kinds  
22 of chemicals that got into the groundwater.

23 The other is perchlorate which is a component of  
24 solid rocket fuel, rocket propellant, that has also been  
25 washed into these pits. And what happened was those

1 chemicals made their way down to the groundwater  
2 through -- through the sand and gravels that -- that  
3 exist near the surface. A couple of hundred feet down  
4 they got into the groundwater and they began to slowly  
5 mix in the groundwater and move with the natural flow of  
6 groundwater towards off site. And they moved -- we know  
7 as far as Lincoln Avenue Water Company wells.

8 Lincoln Avenue Water Company, we have funded a  
9 treatment plant for the Lincoln Avenue Water Company  
10 wells since July 2004, a plant which treats both the  
11 kinds of chemicals that we find in the groundwater, both  
12 the VOCs, volatile organic compounds, and the  
13 perchlorate. It's been working since 2004 and it seems  
14 to be capturing most of the leading edge of the  
15 chemicals in groundwater.

16 Back up on plant site near the source and the  
17 levels -- the levels are still higher near the original  
18 disposal source. Back up on plant site, we had a  
19 meeting a few months ago where we were talking about  
20 expanding a treatment plant that we have here that's  
21 been on since early last year. We call that the source  
22 area treatment. And what we do is on JPL property we  
23 pull up the water with the chemicals and put it through  
24 a treatment plant and then we pump the clean water back  
25 down into the ground. And we keep doing that, pulling

1 up the dirty water and cleaning it up and putting the  
2 clean water back in the ground, that's been ongoing for  
3 over -- for over a year now.

4 What we don't have is we don't have a cleanup. We  
5 don't have any removal out in the middle of the plume  
6 out here, in the large area between Lincoln Avenue  
7 and -- and the JPL site itself. We do not have any  
8 removal going on there. And this is the location where  
9 the City of Pasadena has four of their water supply  
10 wells which has been shut down for years because of  
11 these chemicals. So what we need to do is find a way to  
12 clean up this middle area and to get the City of  
13 Pasadena the ability to use their -- their wells again.

14 What we also need to -- to make sure that we do  
15 is prevent further migration of these chemicals. If we  
16 weren't -- if we didn't do anything, these chemicals  
17 would continue to move slowly downgradient and impact  
18 other water supply companies, other water supply wells  
19 which are -- which are further downgradient.

20 So our proposal is that NASA will -- will work with  
21 the City of Pasadena to -- to get treatment out in this  
22 mid-plume area that we are calling it. The one part of it  
23 is that we continue to use -- continue to fund the  
24 Lincoln Avenue Water Company to continue to do what  
25 they've been doing. It's worked -- worked well and we

1 worked -- work well together and NASA funds all of the  
2 costs of treating for -- for the chemicals in the  
3 groundwater so that they can provide clean drinking  
4 water to their -- their customers.

5 What we also want to do in this proposed plant  
6 is then work with the City of Pasadena to fully fund the  
7 cost of the treatment for -- for getting their wells  
8 back into operation for the design, construction, and  
9 fund the city of Pasadena to lease a treatment system  
10 for these four wells.

11 The -- the technologies that we are proposing to use  
12 are the same technologies that are working successfully  
13 at Lincoln Avenue Water Company. That is for the  
14 volatile organic compounds what we call liquid phase  
15 granular activated carbon. The carbon filter is a  
16 common tried and true filter -- type of filter which is  
17 good in removing a wide variety of chemicals from the  
18 groundwater, but the carbon filter won't remove the  
19 perchlorate so it takes a different kind of treatment.

20 And we're proposing that we use what's called an ion  
21 exchange treatment for treating for perchlorate. It's  
22 the same one that's on at Lincoln Avenue Water Company.  
23 It's a -- it's -- similar systems have been put across  
24 the state and in numerous locations in the last couple  
25 of years and it's working very well. It's gotten a good

1 track record.

2 The size of the system that -- that is needed to  
3 support the City of Pasadena's drinking water,  
4 their -- their water supply needs it's a large volume  
5 system, 7,000 gallons per minute. That's about 10  
6 million gallons per day. So it's a lot of water they  
7 need to pump through during the -- the summer months  
8 when they need their water. They need to be able to  
9 turn the wells on and turn them on at a large volume.  
10 It's a high volume system. And the location that we're  
11 proposing is the Windsor Reservoir Site.

12 So I've talked some quickly about what we -- what we  
13 want to do, what we propose to do and why. Now I want  
14 to talk a little bit about where. And the proposal is  
15 the Windsor Reservoir Site for the City of Pasadena's  
16 treatment system.

17 Next slide, please, Keith. Now we are looking  
18 at a map of -- of JPL and Altadena right across the  
19 Arroyo. And I've talked about the Lincoln Avenue Water  
20 Company wells and their treatment system. We proposed  
21 to continue funding that. The new system would take  
22 water from these four City of Pasadena wells, three of  
23 which are in the Arroyo and one of which is located up  
24 in the Windsor Reservoir Site to a new treatment plant  
25 built next to the Windsor Reservoir.

1     So why are we proposing a site here? And what are  
2     the -- so what are the factors for a good location? And  
3     the factors that we see for a good location is that  
4     there is land available and zoned, that there are access  
5     roads so that we can access them and service the  
6     location, that there are large pipes that are required  
7     for moving these large amounts of water from the wells  
8     up to the location, that the wells are there and working  
9     that pull up the water. And ultimately then there's a  
10    place to put the water after it's treated. It needs  
11    somewhere to go, large volumes of water are being  
12    treated.

13    So we looked at numerous locations when we were  
14    thinking through what the best way to do this might be.  
15    And the first thing that NASA was thinking about was can  
16    we do this all on site? Can we do it on the JPL  
17    property itself? Can we build all of the -- the  
18    treatment facilities at JPL? The problem with that is  
19    that natural groundwater flow flows -- flows away from  
20    JPL to the southeast. And if we were to locate the  
21    extraction wells on the plant site, it would be  
22    impossible to pull back uphill that water that is  
23    already flowing underground in this direction. We would  
24    only be able to impact a small area of the -- of the --  
25    the chemicals in the groundwater under the Arroyo and it

1 would leave a large area of untreated chemicals that  
2 were already underneath the -- the Arroyo.  
3 So we can't -- we wouldn't be able to get most of  
4 that -- that mid-plume area if we were to try to do the  
5 work all from on-site. Another -- another idea that we  
6 considered was trying -- was using the City of Pasadena  
7 wells which are -- their extraction is located in the  
8 right place, but building the plant site somewhere back  
9 on -- on JPL there. After all, this is where the  
10 chemicals came from, where they originated from, so why  
11 couldn't we put the plant back on over on the JPL  
12 property? The biggest problem with that was getting  
13 these large volumes of water across the Arroyo.  
14 It would mean a major construction project of  
15 building a large pipeline over to JPL to locate the  
16 treatment plant and then pumping the water  
17 through another large pipeline in the other direction  
18 back to the -- back to the Windsor Reservoir. And the  
19 problem with that is a major construction project of  
20 large pipelines. And when you move 10 million gallons  
21 per day it takes some -- some big pipelines. It would  
22 take a couple of big pipelines across the Arroyo. And  
23 the other problem with that is the electricity to move  
24 water -- water is heavy. Electricity to move water that  
25 far, it was like, you're going to need 5000 feet around

1 a pipe one way and 5000 feet around in the other way and  
2 the electricity to pump that water back and forth was  
3 just enormous. It would -- it would have been a severe  
4 drain on the electrical supplies of the area.

5 Other considerations were is there a way to locate  
6 the plant in the Arroyo. There are a couple of -- of  
7 sites in the Arroyo. One is at the Ventura well. There  
8 is currently an air stripping plant down in there where  
9 in the past when the VOCs were -- were the chemical that  
10 was -- the only chemical that needed to be removed,  
11 there was a treatment plant that NASA funded for the  
12 City of Pasadena, that's been shut down for several  
13 years. And the plan is not to have that treatment plant  
14 down in the Arroyo anymore.

15 So why couldn't we locate the new treatment plant  
16 here in the Arroyo? The problem with that is just  
17 the size. There's a small pad there and it's perched  
18 right along below the -- below the slope at the bottom  
19 of the hill on a narrow area before the -- these city --  
20 these infiltration ponds, the basins here. And in order  
21 to build down there we would have to either fill in some  
22 of these ponds or somehow build a plant that was very  
23 narrow but very long to be able to fit the plant  
24 components down there. It would be beside the Arroyo  
25 and have a high impact on the Arroyo. So that option



1 had its problems.

2 There's a -- the City of Pasadena also owns a  
3 surface water treatment plant back up here called the  
4 Behner Plant. It's also a relatively small area on the  
5 side of the Arroyo. There's an existing -- there's a  
6 surface water treatment plant that they haven't used for  
7 several years but in the past they've been able to take  
8 surface water, the rain water, up that's coming down the  
9 stream and take it in and clean it up and then use it  
10 for some of their -- their water supply water.

11 If we were to -- to use that site, we would have to  
12 tear down this existing plant and we would have to  
13 expand the area to be able to fit, and then we would  
14 have to try to find a way to get in there because  
15 there's a very -- there's a small forest service road  
16 right now that's pretty narrow that probably would not  
17 support just bringing the equipment and trucks in and  
18 out. So there would probably be a lot of road  
19 construction. And then the pipelines don't go there, so  
20 there would be some major pipeline construction. And  
21 also just a lot of pumping water back and forth from  
22 these wells up and back and forth. It was just major  
23 construction, pipelines and -- and electrical  
24 consumption issues.

25 So what it is that we're proposing is that there's a

1 site here called the Windsor Reservoir Property and  
2 that's the proposal I'll talk about a little bit more.  
3 The one other question that might be asked is why  
4 can't this be done by the Lincoln Avenue System? And  
5 the earlier picture showed the Lincoln Avenue wells  
6 probably capturing the front of the plume, probably  
7 capturing most of it. The problem with the Lincoln  
8 Avenue System is it's a smaller volume. It's 2000  
9 gallons per minute -- I'm sorry -- 2000 gallons --  
10 gallons per minute system and Lincoln Avenue has  
11 smaller water rights. And the ability to pump here is  
12 much, much smaller, about the tenth of the ability  
13 to pump over here.  
14 So if -- if these wells were able to capture the  
15 plume -- and there's not a guarantee with the -- the  
16 amount of the pumping that they do, some of the  
17 chemicals might be able to escape past these wells, if  
18 these wells are the other thing that was -- that was  
19 pumping. But the other thing is since they use -- they  
20 pump such a smaller volume, the time to clean up the  
21 aquifer would probably be about ten times as long. So  
22 instead of this taking a decade or two, it could take a  
23 lifetime or two in that because very slowly  
24 these -- the chemicals that are out in these areas would  
25 move towards these wells. And then in the meantime, the

1 City of Pasadena would have no access to their resource,  
2 would not be able to use their wells or use their water  
3 rights in this area. So just doing it by Lincoln Avenue  
4 by itself is not -- is not the preferred way to do it.

5 So the location that best meets all of -- all of the  
6 criteria is the Windsor Reservoir location. The Windsor  
7 Reservoir location already has a 4.75 million gallon  
8 reservoir to put the -- where the treated water goes  
9 afterwards. That's -- the city has been using that  
10 since early in the last century to -- to store water  
11 before they get it to their customers. It has the  
12 piping and the road access and it has the -- the zoning  
13 and it has electrical service there.

14 Keith. This is an aerial photo with a little more  
15 detail. So I am going to just point out the Windsor  
16 Boulevard. This, the big shiny thing is the roof of  
17 that 4.75 million gallon storage Reservoir,  
18 Windsor -- the Windsor Reservoir, Five Acre School. The  
19 school is right next door on the -- on the east side.  
20 And you can see we do have residents all around this  
21 site. The site is a few acres. And there's a -- right  
22 now there is a large open spot in the center, the people  
23 that live there probably recognize that there's -- the  
24 entrance gate is right here and the road that goes in is  
25 right here. There is an existing water well. The

1 Windsor well is right up in this corner over here. And  
2 then it gets a little hard to see but there's an  
3 existing electrical transformer bank here, a couple of  
4 service buildings. I think some of them may be  
5 electrical. There is actually a tin building here, a  
6 shed over here.

7 And so I just kind of wanted to point out the  
8 landmarks. And I think the reason we have put  
9 the -- this patch mark here is this is what we think is  
10 the reasonably larger pad area, the area that might have  
11 to be covered by this new -- the concrete pad that would  
12 be built to hold this new treatment system could be as  
13 large as this. We put in this area because we think we  
14 can avoid cutting down trees. We might not have to cut  
15 down any. It looks like we definitely would be able to  
16 probably miss all the oak trees. There's one or two  
17 sick trees out here that might be -- that could be  
18 affected by the area that we need to take up.

19 So I think that the question that -- that would be  
20 on my mind if I were a neighbor is what will this plant  
21 look like. What could it look like? I'd like to say we  
22 know exactly but we haven't -- it hasn't been chosen  
23 yet. The vendor for the plant has not been chosen.  
24 That's something that will be done in the future.  
25 However, we did take some photographs. We took some

1 pictures and we superimposed with the computer  
2 some -- some -- some stuff on them so we could get sort  
3 of an idea of what it might look like.

4 So, Keith, you want to give us the next slide? This  
5 picture is taken directly across the road looking into  
6 the gate, where we showed that -- where the pad might  
7 be. It's from about the front of these pickup trucks up  
8 along and probably ending somewhere up here out in the  
9 middle of that open area out there. And so this is the  
10 base picture before -- before we retouched it.

11 Keith, next photo. This photo is a computer  
12 animation generation of what it could look like. I  
13 believe we are going to need to upgrade the street along  
14 there and fix the street and then the -- this is one of  
15 the -- the type of systems that is used where they have  
16 tanks, one of the vendors uses all tanks.

17 Next, Keith. Then another vendor uses a -- some  
18 things that are more like cargo boxes that they put part  
19 of it in and then they used lesser number of tanks, used  
20 a combination of cargo boxes and tanks.

21 Next, Keith. This one is, if you were to put up  
22 some vegetation along the fence and a little bit of  
23 screening on the fence, that will take care of some of  
24 the visual impact of being able to see this as you look  
25 into the site, drive by, or standing or walking by. And

1 here is an example of one that was recently put in by  
2 the City of Pasadena, a green screen where they tried to  
3 use vegetation to help make a nicer looking, more  
4 natural looking visual barrier.

5 Next: This is if you were -- you're standing just a  
6 little south across the road. This gives you an idea of  
7 another view of the site. The gate to go in is here.  
8 We put some of this green screen in with the computer  
9 program and left -- left the tanks back here. We  
10 believe these tanks back here, the way they are shown,  
11 are pretty tall. These are probably 18 feet, maybe 20  
12 feet tall. Most of the tanks will be no taller than  
13 that and some of them could be shorter than that. The  
14 type of -- the vendors were able to supply different  
15 kinds of tanks. We wanted to go ahead and show what  
16 might be a worse case scenario; so we are not hiding  
17 what they could look like.

18 Do we have another one, Keith? No. That's the last  
19 one. So -- do you have the road map one up?

20 MS. FELLOWS: Next steps.

21 MR. SLATEN: Next steps. Yeah. So what is the  
22 process and what's the end point and what's going to  
23 happen next? I am going to go out to the end point and  
24 that is that the plan is that this plant is ready to  
25 serve water. It's ready for the City of Pasadena to

1 turn it on and be able to use it for water supply for  
2 their customers, but we're way back here at the  
3 beginning of the process.

4 Back just off of this in -- it was just January when  
5 the City of Pasadena and NASA reached an agreement that  
6 NASA would fully fund a treatment plant to pay for all  
7 of the cost of -- of designing, construction, and  
8 operation of a treatment plant to remove all of the  
9 chemicals that NASA was responsible for in the water.

10 So now we're along here and we're just out of April  
11 now and we're in a public comment period for NASA's  
12 proposed plan. This is this document where we propose  
13 what we think we would like to do and we solicit public  
14 comments. And it's -- it's important too. It's a  
15 requirement that we have a meeting like this and solicit  
16 comments. But it's also important to us to hear what  
17 people have to say, what ideas they have, because then  
18 we will be able to deal with those. We are required to  
19 take the comments and write up a responsiveness summary  
20 that talks about how the comment was considered and if  
21 we made any changes to the plan due to the comment.

22 The process then takes us along where this  
23 summary -- and up on the top is the -- is the NASA  
24 process. I want to point out because this is a  
25 partnership between NASA and the City of Pasadena; the

1 City of Pasadena has their processes and NASA has  
2 theirs. We try to make them work together as much as  
3 possible but we have our requirements such as having  
4 this public comment period and this meeting. We will  
5 also then consider all of the comments from the public  
6 comment period and responsiveness summary. And some  
7 time this Summer, NASA will issue their record of  
8 decision. And then NASA will continue on helping with  
9 the system design and construction.

10 Some of the other processes that are with the City,  
11 and this will be important to -- to the people who are  
12 following the process, is the City has responsibility  
13 for -- under the California Environmental Quality Act.  
14 They will prepare an initial study and at the same time  
15 they will be working with what's called a conditional use  
16 permit. And this is the point -- we're early in the  
17 process, yet now. We don't know all the details.

18 Another step, there will be more details talked  
19 about that are the environmental impacts, the things  
20 like noise, dust, lights, visual. There is a long list  
21 of things that have to be considered in detail and dealt  
22 with as a part of this CEQA initial study. So this is  
23 another important point that's coming along some time  
24 this summer.

25 There will be a public comment period and a public



1 meeting that the City of Pasadena will host. So this is  
2 an important thing to keep in mind. We don't have all  
3 the answers now. I can't tell you exactly what it will  
4 look like. I can't tell you exactly how we are going to  
5 keep dust down, although we are. I can't tell you  
6 exactly what kind of fencing or visual barriers there  
7 would be. But there will be much more detail in the  
8 CEQA initial study to deal with those things.

9 After that the City will go out and find the vendor  
10 and then we'll know a lot more what the exact  
11 configuration will be. And then the process continues  
12 along with a building permit. There is the -- DHS has  
13 a -- also has a public process where near the end -- Oh,  
14 I'm sorry. Department of Health Services, the drinking  
15 water regulators, they will -- for the purposes of  
16 issuing this plant a drinking water permit, they also  
17 have a process near the end which talks about the  
18 appropriateness of you to -- how to use this for  
19 drinking water or how to operate the plant and things  
20 like that. That will happen way near the end before  
21 it's turned on to serve water.

22 So that's what I wanted to talk about.

23 MS. FELLOWS: Okay. Thanks, Steve.

24 Now we're at the point where we take public  
25 comments. But first if you have any questions or

1 clarifications, you can address those to Steve. I would  
2 like you to state your name and address for the record,  
3 if you would. And if you have those comment cards or  
4 you want one to fill out and have us ask those  
5 questions, just raise your hand and somebody will bring  
6 you one.

7 Do you want a comment card or --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't want a comment card.

9 MS. FELLOWS: Okay. We'll come right to you in a  
10 second. Oh, and microphones.

11 MS. GARNER: I think the best thing to do, if we  
12 keep both of them on, apparently that will cut down on  
13 the --

14 MS. FELLOWS: Oh, okay. I'm ready to test it.

15 Yeah. This is wireless so that's why we get some of  
16 this feedback.

17 ALONZO EDWARDS: Hi. My name is Alonzo Edwards, 965  
18 West Woodbury Road. I'm also president of the Windsor  
19 Arroyo Neighborhood Association. The questions that I  
20 have is: Other than the Windsor site -- I heard you all  
21 and all the alternatives you have, what other alternate  
22 sites are being proposed or are there? Or are there any  
23 alternate sites being proposed other than this one here?

24 MR. SLATEN: We looked at several sites and we are  
25 proposing one site.

1 MS. FELLOWS: That's the -- that's the preferred  
2 alternative. It's the site.

3 ALONZO EDWARDS: Okay. So the answer to that  
4 question -- one other question I have is this there is  
5 also another reservoir further down on Arroyo Boulevard  
6 near Stanton Street in the City of Pasadena, did you  
7 guys consider that site down there, do you know?

8 MR. SLATEN: I'll answer. The name of that  
9 is the --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sheldon.

11 MR. SLATEN: -- Sheldon. Sheldon Reservoir is on  
12 the other side of the interstate and then down a third  
13 of a mile or something or other. No, we didn't  
14 specifically look at that. But all of the -- the  
15 reasons about having to build pipelines and move water  
16 downhill and uphill apply to that site even more than  
17 the other sites that are closer.

18 ALONZO EDWARDS: So if I understand it, this is the  
19 only viable site based on all the estimates that you  
20 came to today, and this is the -- this is the conclusion  
21 that you've come to that this is the best site cost  
22 effective so to speak; am I correct on that?

23 MR. SLATEN: Based on all those factors that I  
24 talked about, the ability to get the water back and  
25 forth and what it would take to construct -- all those

1 factors I talked about, we proposed this site because

2 it's the best site -- almost the only site that works.

3 ALONZO EDWARDS: Okay. Then other than these

4 community meetings that we have, how can the public,

5 particularly the neighbors that live in the -- in that

6 area, how can we become actively involved from this

7 point forward other than these meetings?

8 For instance, if we wanted to be involved in

9 the selection of the vendor, we want to be involved with

10 the grading, we want to be involved with the aesthetics.

11 I mean if -- if they elect gold or brown, you know. How

12 can we as a community or a neighborhood become more

13 actively involved other than having NASA come in here

14 and give us proposals and these little comments?

15 This is something that we have to look at every day.

16 I saw those vendors and what you proposed and they're

17 unacceptable. We don't want to look at those ugly

18 looking tanks every day. I can tell you that right now,

19 that will not go. And we need something to make an

20 aesthetic completion and that's a demand. It's not a

21 request, that's a demand.

22 So the question that I am proposing to you, you may

23 not be able to answer right now, is this community

24 demands to be actively involved in every aspect of the

25 construction of this site, this one right here. For

1 instance, these street lights on Windsor Avenue -- there  
2 is just too much traffic going on there right now. So  
3 my question to you is -- I don't know if you can refer  
4 to this -- how can we become involved in this process  
5 other than these meetings we have right now? And if  
6 not, could we build something imminent where we are?

7 MR. SLATEN: Of course. Tonight is a place where  
8 you can be involved. You can also -- you're making a  
9 comment that you want to be involved further. How that  
10 exactly would look like, I don't know yet. It's a good  
11 comment --

12 MR. RIPPERDA: Could I say something, Steve?

13 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

14 MR. RIPPERDA: My name is Mark and I work with the  
15 Environmental Protection Agency and I work on a number  
16 of other sites similar to this. And when a community, a  
17 small group from a community, really has concerns like  
18 yours there is various names that can be given to it.  
19 But you establish a working group. And it doesn't have  
20 to have any formal title, but you -- you know, it's  
21 worked out between you and NASA where you meet weekly,  
22 you meet once a month, and you basically sit down in  
23 your group with them, not in a big public forum with all  
24 these other agencies and all the other people who aren't  
25 in your community. So there are ways that NASA can set

1 up a group that meets on a regular basis just with your

2 group so there's an ongoing dialogue and --

3 MS. CURRIE: On behalf of the City, you know, I've

4 had a process where we can deal with the community's

5 concerns about what this looks like, what the noise

6 impacts are. We are required to look at all the

7 environmental impacts and that part and hear your issues

8 and make a proposal to you. But I think going beyond

9 that, we're prepared to work with NASA to see what can

10 we do to make this plant as acceptable as possible. I

11 think, you know, we understand your concerns. We do.

12 MS. FELLOWS: This is Annie. Just write down Annie.

13 ANNIE MORGAN WILLIAMSON: The City worked with my mother years

14 ago to have just the -- the [verns] or whatever is out there and

15 she had to go through a monumental process to even get

16 that.

17 MS. CURRIE: We will work with you. We will come to

18 you and we will hear you.

19 ANNIE MORGAN-WILLIAMSON: Okay. Because the fence -- I have

20 to agree with him. It should be an ongoing thing. The fence is

21 unacceptable because we're living right across that. It

22 starts at the end of the yard and it's going to

23 encompass our whole lawn.

24 MS. CURRIE: You know, I think what we are getting

25 down to is all of us sitting down, okay. Because, you

1 know, I'm looking at that factory too. So if it -- if  
2 we say we don't want to see any of those tanks, that  
3 means somebody is going to have to go up and turn -- you  
4 know some barriers. So we're going to have to work our,  
5 you know, choice A, choice B, choice -- and decide what  
6 works for all of us. And I will commit to that.  
7 We will work with you and we won't make it a monumental  
8 process. We will not storm all of you. We'll be up  
9 front with you.

10 ANNIE MORGAN-WILLIAMSON: Also -- I was also concerned about  
11 in that particular cul-de-sac most of the persons that are  
12 living there are a minimum age of 70 on up to the 90s.  
13 Respiratory problems are rampant in that area. He was  
14 also talking about the dust factor. Also from a certain  
15 point in the morning until a certain point in the  
16 afternoon, there is a lot of noise over there that used  
17 to not be. And I have made comments. Some other people  
18 have made suggestions down to the city and we've got no  
19 response.

20 MS. CURRIE: Well, I understand from talking to  
21 people that we haven't been the best neighbor. I, first  
22 of all, apologize for that and give you my commitment  
23 that we will be a better neighbor going forward.

24 TECUMSEH SHACKELFORD: Well, I do want to say one  
25 thing because I heard you say you want to be a better

1 neighbor -- Oh, I'm sorry.

2 MS. FELLOWS: We're going to be here for a little  
3 while. So you --

4 TECUMSEH SHACKELFORD: All right. My name is  
5 Tecumseh Shackelford, Vice President of the Windsor  
6 Arroyo Neighborhood Association. Now I will say one  
7 thing and I know we didn't have any problems there but  
8 when a neighbor did come to me and ask me about some  
9 things and I did talk to Joyce Streater, she did solve  
10 those problems. So I don't want to say we haven't had  
11 one hundred percent bad news. What -- Joyce did come  
12 and did solve some of the problems.

13 MS. CURRIE: I'm not trying to take over the meeting  
14 you guys.

15 MS. FELLOWS: Let's -- (inaudible) because we affirm  
16 the (inaudible) residents of Pasadena. In fact we will  
17 share with the media and communities.

18 SUE PICKER: Hi. I'm Sue Picker that will be  
19 22 Mountain View Street. I'm actually an Altadena  
20 resident but I'm right above where that is. And I  
21 looked at what is going to happen with the traffic with  
22 the broadening of the street and then the abrupt  
23 shortening of it. It's already schizophrenic enough  
24 to come up Windsor from Woodbury. It's two lanes,  
25 and it's one lane, and it's three lanes, and then it's



1 one lane. And a lot of you are here from JPL, but I  
2 (inaudible), but all rocket scientists don't know how to  
3 drive. And if it's worth your life, I tell people, look  
4 slowly, look out, watch for people, they get confused,  
5 it's one lane, it's two lanes, you know. And I am just  
6 concerned we are going to have another little, you know,  
7 abrupt kind of shift. And it would be nice if we could  
8 have that street be one lane or two lanes because this  
9 is crazy making. And now that street has become a  
10 thoroughfare up to La Vina. People in SUVs and Hummers,  
11 they drive even worse than rocket scientists. So  
12 there's a stop sign, it's hidden around the corner.  
13 And, you know, it's really very, very, dangerous around  
14 there, very dangerous. If I want to make a right-hand  
15 turn, it's a very soft corner there into Mountain View  
16 and if I slow down, people just want to drive over me  
17 and I have to purposely slow down really, really, really  
18 to go slow so they get the idea to -- just to pass me.  
19 So I am very concerned about what the traffic looks like  
20 there. So that would be my major concerns. Thank you.  
21 MS. CURRIE: I am going to sit down.  
22 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. Thank you. Before we go to the  
23 next one, let me just answer a little bit about the  
24 traffic. There will be -- there will be some traffic  
25 associated with building this plant, very little bit

1 associated with operating it. But also as a part of the  
2 processes, we are going to have to look at the -- the  
3 improvements that are going to be needed to the street  
4 out front, how our trucks are going to be able to get  
5 out of traffic when turning in. So all of those things  
6 are going to be a part of things that we have to deal  
7 with. We want to do them right and we want to make it  
8 better and we want to be good neighbors on that.

9 So during the construction there will be some  
10 traffic. We are going to have to have a traffic plan.  
11 We'll have to work with the city and have a traffic plan  
12 of how we get our trucks in there, the larger trucks in  
13 to keep them out of traffic. There will be -- the  
14 construction activities will have trucks coming in and  
15 out. They're sort of similar to building a house,  
16 trucks that come in and put down forms and trucks that  
17 come in and put the barrier around and they'll have to  
18 bring dirt and working equipment, things like that.  
19 There will be some traffic and that's part of the  
20 process we are going to have to deal with. And we are  
21 going to have to build an entrance and have to take care  
22 of that, have traffic management. So we will -- we're  
23 cognizant of that being one of the issues.  
24 MS. FELLOWS: If you could take -- sorry. I  
25 couldn't see that.

1 CHARLES HOPE: My name is Charles Hope. I live at  
2 963 North Lehigh Street, Altadena, right behind the lady  
3 who just spoke. My question is what kind of  
4 compensation are you offering the residents in the area?  
5 (Inaudible) who live there -- whatever goes on in that  
6 area. There should be some kind of compensation down  
7 the line. Thank you.

8 ZACHARY GUTIERREZ: Good evening. My name is  
9 Zachary Gutierrez. I live at 1010 La Canada Verdugo  
10 Road. It's actually in the City of Pasadena. And this  
11 is -- I am a new resident there, so this is the first  
12 time I've learned about this. I have more of a  
13 technical question for you. For clarification, I think  
14 you mentioned that with respect to the water treatment  
15 plant that is actually on premises at JPL, am I correct  
16 that when you folks are treating our water, it's being  
17 pumped back into the well; is that correct?

18 MR. SLATEN: It's being pumped back into another  
19 well just up hill and upgradient; it just -- we're  
20 affecting a small area there about eight acres where  
21 most of the chemicals are still travelling underground.

22 ZACHARY GUTIERREZ: Okay. The proposed plan, the  
23 Windsor plant, the water is going to be treated and then  
24 placed into the holding tank; is that what I'm  
25 understanding, not pumped back in?

1 MR. SLATEN: That's correct. To be used for the  
2 City of Pasadena for water supply.

3 ZACHARY GUTIERREZ: Okay. Going back to the plant,  
4 though, at JPL, if you folks are pumping it back into  
5 the well whether it's the same well that you extract the  
6 water from or another well, what if anything is being  
7 done to treat the soil where the actual perchlorates and  
8 all these chemicals are at? Because it seems to me that  
9 if you're treating the water and putting it back in the  
10 soil, it's going to go down the same gradient, it's  
11 going to go down the same plume and we are going to be  
12 back at square one. So what if anything is being done  
13 to treat the soil which is the source for the  
14 contamination?

15 MR. SLATEN: I actually didn't start all the way  
16 back at the beginning and tell you all the history of  
17 everything that went on tonight because I wanted to  
18 focus on the new plan. But let me take just a second to  
19 go back.

20 On the plant site itself where disposal occurred,  
21 liquid wastes were put in pits and it pretty much soaked  
22 straight down into the groundwater a couple hundred  
23 feet. It left behind in the dry soil above the water  
24 tables -- it left behind volatile organic compounds.  
25 One of the first actions that was taken at the site over

1 the last several years was in fact put vacuum cleaners  
2 in the ground and suck the air out that had those  
3 volatiles and since they're volatile we were able to  
4 suck it out. We sucked out several hundred pounds of  
5 volatile organic compounds out of the dry soil so it  
6 wouldn't be a continuing source to groundwater in the  
7 future. And we're actually just about through with that  
8 process. We have turned the system off and we're  
9 watching the levels to make sure that they don't come  
10 back up in the -- in the soil gas, and we think we're  
11 through with that.

12 So we've actually dealt with the -- with the source  
13 that's above the water table. What we are dealing with  
14 now in the water table is the higher levels so they  
15 won't be a continuing source for the next hundred or a  
16 thousand years. We are catching them and we are moving  
17 them right up near the source.

18 ZACHARY GUTIERREZ: But it's a different plume  
19 that's used for the VOCs as it is -- as compared to the  
20 perchlorate?

21 MR. SLATEN: Correct.

22 ZACHARY GUTIERREZ: So what if anything was done to  
23 remove the perchlorate because you indicated earlier  
24 that you can't use a carbon filter?

25 MS. FELLOWS: Well, I think one thing is that

1 putting clean water back in. I'm not --

2 MR. SLATEN: We are using a biological treatment  
3 system to remove the perchlorate on-site. It's a  
4 different -- it's a different technology but it's  
5 working very well. We use a combination of the charcoal  
6 filter and a biological filter with actually occurring  
7 bacteria that would eat the perchlorate. That's what's  
8 occurring on that site.

9 And I didn't focus on it tonight because we've had a  
10 lot of meetings on that in the past and we're well down  
11 that road. I'll spend all the time with you that will  
12 bring you up to speed.

13 MS. FELLOWS: No, Wait. This is good. And we have  
14 a display out there on that site and a couple of experts  
15 that really work solely on that site and they can talk  
16 to you.

17 MR. SLATEN: We've removed hundreds of pounds of  
18 chemicals with that treatment system already and it's  
19 working very well. And we're going to keep that one and  
20 turn it on.

21 MR. ZAIDI: I can answer your question about the  
22 perchlorate as well. Perchlorate is the soil based  
23 (inaudible.) And whatever was there (inaudible) it has  
24 to dissolve and come down through the wells through the  
25 unsaturated (inaudible.) So (inaudible) very much soil

1 grains. So we are expecting that this -- in other  
2 words, a significant amount of perchlorate left from  
3 over the last 50, 60 years when this occurred. So it's  
4 a matter of 60 years. And we are expecting that  
5 everything has gone through the groundwater which is  
6 evident from the power analysis which is returned from  
7 the wells. So we are expecting that there is not much  
8 perchlorate left in the soil. So does that answer your  
9 question?

10 ZACHARY GUTIERREZ: Well, it does. I'm a lawyer and  
11 I've worked on pollution cases so I kind of have a  
12 little bit of a -- I've got two kids and I'm a little  
13 bit leery about the whole thing.

14 MS. FELLOWS: Lori, we'll go to Valerie and  
15 then -- Oh, I'm sorry.

16 HENRIE COMELY: Henrie Comely, 2575 Vista Laguna  
17 Terrace, Pasadena. Two questions, I think, like the  
18 lawyer says. One, what is the environmental impact for  
19 the neighbors exactly adjacent to this project? You  
20 speak as the community as a whole but that would seem to  
21 me unacceptable if you have a cluster of homes right  
22 there in the vicinity, and I live maybe ten blocks away.  
23 You cannot evaluate or you should not evaluate them as  
24 you would me.

25 Number two, the projection on the screen is

1 unacceptable. Maybe that's all the vendors have but  
2 surely you have a landscaping engineer or someone that  
3 could put up beams, something that when I drive by  
4 there, I'm not looking at some type of military bunker  
5 or something. Let's see -- I think I had something else  
6 here. The -- I was interested in cleanup too. Because  
7 I -- maybe you misspoke or something but I thought you  
8 said you pulled the water out and you took the water  
9 back. I didn't hear you say about the new tank up there  
10 above it which would eventually filter down. I think  
11 that was it.

12 I think that whether the people want to accept it or  
13 not, we have a nice community, we'd like to believe. If  
14 we do anything, we want to upgrade. We don't want  
15 this -- all these tanks that you are going to drop in  
16 our area that you wouldn't put in any other area. Let's  
17 be serious here. So you get to the moon, okay. You all  
18 put it in the ground, so I think you can come up with a  
19 way to make it aesthetically beautiful, so our  
20 neighborhood can be upgraded and not downgraded. So  
21 that the value of our property will not go down but  
22 continue to go up.

23 Thank you.

24 MS. FELLOWS: And that's a goal for us too. I think  
25 a lot of those ideas having us have a group that we work



1 with, for instance, particularly on the aesthetics  
2 because you have to see it every day. The other  
3 things will come and go. We hope we can work with  
4 you on that very closely and try to come up with a good  
5 design.

6 Did you want to say something or is that just a  
7 comment?

8 MR. SLATEN: I think that's a good comment. I think  
9 we understand that the neighbors that are closest are  
10 going to be the ones that are most impacted both by the  
11 construction and by having the plant located here and we  
12 have to take that into consideration.

13 HENRIE COMELY: Oh, I'm sorry. The treatment of the  
14 water, the process, is that like a nuclear power plant  
15 and everything goes up in the steam that everyone is  
16 denying that it's going up in steam? Or how is it  
17 treated so that it is not going back out into the  
18 environment?

19 MS. FELLOWS: Are you talking about the one that  
20 we're proposing at Windsor or the one on the site?

21 HENRIE COMELY: (Inaudible.)

22 MR. SLATEN: The proposed treatment plant at Windsor  
23 Reservoir would be totally contained inside pipes and  
24 vessels. And inside these -- these vessels -- we should  
25 probably show some pictures of them are -- is the filter

1 media the stuff that filters out, little carbon  
2 particles and in another case it's little plastic beads  
3 that grab hold of the perchlorate and that's the --  
4 that's the filter mechanism. So there is not going to  
5 be anything that's open. There's not going to be  
6 anything that's heated. It's not a refinery, you know,  
7 with fires or anything like that. These are closed  
8 tanks. Everything is enclosed. There is just --  
9 there's no emissions. There will be -- there is a little  
10 noise associated with it and any that might be generated  
11 by some pumps or something, we can do things to cut down  
12 the noise by putting sound barriers. So, no, it's a  
13 totally enclosed system and it's going to be a quiet  
14 system.

15 MS. FELLOWS: So the only thing that comes out of  
16 that is clean water.

17 MR. SLATEN: And the clean water -- I think you said  
18 something -- the clean water goes into the Windsor  
19 Reservoir which it has for almost a hundred years. The  
20 water has gone there to the reservoir and the City of  
21 Pasadena to store before it goes out to the distribution  
22 plant.

23 HENRIE COMELY: Will that be our drinking water?

24 MR. SLATEN: It always has been except for the last  
25 few years.

1 HENRIE COMELY: No wonder a lot of people in that  
2 area have cancer. That explains it.

3 DEIRDRE WEST: Hi. My name is Deirdre West. I live  
4 at 2919 Sterling Place in Altadena. I have a question  
5 for you, is there -- is there any kind of off haul  
6 chemicals? I don't quite understand what happens to the  
7 perchlorates etcetera when they get pulled out of the  
8 system.

9 MR. SLATEN: Okay. All right. For both the carbon  
10 filter and the ion exchange, which is these little  
11 plastic beads, those attract and trap the chemicals both  
12 the volatile organic compounds and the perchlorate and  
13 then they get those chemicals trapped on. And every few  
14 weeks a truck will need to come in and take the -- and  
15 hook up a hose, suck out the old chemicals and they'll  
16 blow out because they're little tiny beads and pieces of  
17 charcoal basically. And then they'll pump in new  
18 chemicals. Those old chemicals will be taken off-site,  
19 I understand, out of California to be probably burned or  
20 disposed some other way that's -- with all the  
21 applicable environmental regulations.

22 DEIRDRE WEST: Okay. So you think a truck every  
23 couple of weeks if you were to estimate?

24 MR. SLATEN: I think we are thinking of every few  
25 weeks. We don't know exactly but we haven't chosen the

1 vendor. We'll have to put in new filter media on a  
2 fairly regular basis because it's doing its job taking  
3 those chemicals out.

4 SUSAN SANTOS: Can you give an estimate? Is it a few weeks  
5 like maybe two to three or three to four?

6 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. We don't know. That's why I  
7 (inaudible.) I heard it might be about every three  
8 weeks, every four weeks. I don't think it's every two  
9 weeks. We don't know yet. It partly depends on the  
10 vendor.

11 DEIRDRE WEST: I'm the Environmental Planner  
12 with the Metropolitan Water District and a resident.  
13 And it's been my experience working with the water  
14 district that we have much less environmental -- much  
15 less environmental impacts from these types of projects  
16 that we are including these mitigation measures very,  
17 very early in the design process. And what we find, we  
18 already have the project and we are doing a CEQA  
19 document on it and then we're throwing these mitigation  
20 measures on top of it that are never quite as effective  
21 as if we're implementing that into the planning process.  
22 And it just seems to me that the way that you showed the  
23 time line up there, it's sort of like we are going to  
24 design the project and get with the city and then the  
25 city is going to think about and worry about the

1 environmental impacts in that project.

2 And what I would like to see is in the design

3 process you looking at things maybe subgrade, you know,

4 maybe even below grade, maybe it will cost you a little

5 bit more money, but it sure will be worth having less

6 headaches than you are going to have with the neighbors.

7 Things like enclosing these facilities, you know,

8 obviously professional landscape architects because I

9 have found, you know, no offense, engineers are

10 generally not that creative when it comes to landscape,

11 architecture, you know, lighting, you know -- there is

12 so many things if done early on, you just have such a

13 better product in the end. And I would hate to see it

14 saying, well, this is our vendor, this is what it is

15 going to look like, throw it at the city and let them

16 try to come up with a way to mitigate it. I'd rather

17 see this happen early on and embedded in the facility.

18 I am very concerned about noise. My house backs up

19 to the JPL trail and I have a constant whining out of

20 JPL now. And let me tell you, I have called and called

21 and called and there has never been any mitigation for

22 that whine. And I have taken my own little handheld

23 noise devices that I use when working our little studies

24 and you are exceeding the noise ordinance standards at

25 night there when I am standing outside my door. And so

1 far I have had, you know, no word from JPL on this.

2 So I hate to say you are going to buy these tanks

3 and you are getting this amount of noise, the pumps will

4 make this amount of noise and we're going to try to

5 mitigate it. I'd like to see that integrated into the

6 design process.

7 MS. FELLOWS: Lori, we'll go up to Valerie and then

8 to this woman here and then to Marietta and then to

9 Annie and then to you.

10 VALERIE CODDEL: Hi, my name is Valerie Caudel and I

11 live -- my bedroom door will be right outside of

12 this -- my bedroom window will be right outside this

13 treatment plant. I have many concerns and I have voiced

14 them. What you brought tonight, I -- knowing what I

15 wanted or my expectations, this -- that is not -- that's

16 not what I want. I want something that I don't have to

17 look at when I look outside my window. There's a view

18 there of trees, there's the mountain, and if you put

19 that there, you know, all that beautiful scenery is

20 gone.

21 I have lots of concerns. One, the noise. It looks

22 like it is too high-tech that's going on there. I

23 visited the -- the Lincoln site and it was very noisy,

24 very noisy standing across the street, you know, there

25 was no design, there's nothing. I don't know how the

1 neighbors allowed that site to go in there looking like  
2 it looked. It looks totally out of place. That's not  
3 what we want in that particular area.

4 Also you stated that it would only be operating  
5 three months out of the year. So my question is, is  
6 that -- you said only during the summertime?

7 MR. SLATEN: I -- I said that. It's actually a  
8 six-month period.

9 VALERIE CAUDEL: Oh, now it's six months. It was  
10 three months. So now we're looking at even maybe a  
11 year. So the point is is that, you know, yeah, you  
12 stated during the summer months at the last meeting. So  
13 because that was the question that, you know, if you are  
14 only going to run it six months, what impact does that  
15 have on cleaning up the perchlorate and all that in the  
16 water for the three months or six months out of the  
17 year? I'm thinking that once it's in, it's going to  
18 be going 24/7 and that's not what we want or not what I  
19 want.

20 Ms. Currie, hi. I have had a long standing  
21 relationship with (inaudible) over there since I've  
22 lived there 25 years back to Mr. (inaudible.) You know,  
23 it's been an ongoing process with dumping all through  
24 the night, noise. I mean cleanup trucks, you name it,  
25 debris, there's been all types of toilets -- everything

1 on that site. And I just -- I've been disgusted with  
2 this site for years, but, you know, I've done everything  
3 I could possibly do other than clean it up myself. It's  
4 been bad. I just wanted to let you know. I had your  
5 name on the list of names. But I don't think I've  
6 called you.

7 And so I just want to see, you know, if we decide to  
8 put this in the area and I mean I feel like it's a done  
9 deal and I don't want to feel that way. I want to know  
10 that, you know, our concerns and if this is something  
11 that we can say we want or reject. And I don't feel  
12 that -- that this -- to me that this is going in whether  
13 we like it or not, but we don't want to see it.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. FELLOWS: I'm sorry. I did need your last name.  
16 I forgot your name.

17 INGRID RICHARDSON: Ingrid Richardson. We're Ingrid  
18 and Tracey Richardson and we live at 2960 Crestford  
19 which is the cul-de-sac south of Altadena Drive and we  
20 look right into JPL. And I've had this question since  
21 last time about when property -- now as pricing changes  
22 nears because there are a lot of properties up on the  
23 market. And there was recently a house on the market  
24 right on our street and it was advertised and listed for  
25 like \$400,000 and it said, you know, whatever the



1 bedrooms and bathrooms and it said view of JPL, you  
2 know. And I'm just wondering if you have any kind of  
3 information or input or guidelines what a homeowner  
4 would have to disclose if they sold the property right  
5 now, you know, like close to the contamination site.

6 And just recently my husband and I looked at another  
7 property, I suppose you guys have looked at it too. We  
8 got an address at, you know, one of those realtor things  
9 at the corner of El Nido and Ventura. And it also said,  
10 you know, view of JPL and Gabrielle Canyon beautiful,  
11 you know, wilderness area. And I am just wondering  
12 maybe this is not the area but this question has been on  
13 my mind because a lot of people maybe they -- some day  
14 they are going to retire and they want to sell their  
15 homes in Altadena, not that we want to, but it's  
16 possible.

17 MS. FELLOWS: We don't have a guideline (inaudible.)

18 INGRID RICHARDSON: And you don't know what people  
19 are doing that are selling their homes?

20 MS. FELLOWS: I know they're making a lot of profit,  
21 but I don't (inaudible.)

22 Let's see, Marietta, I think is next (inaudible.)

23 MARIETTA KRUELLS: Hello. I'm Marietta KrueLLs.

24 I'm an Altadena resident and I always think about how

25 I'm going to ask my final question and then I

1 accommodate everyone (inaudible.) But I was also  
2 concerned at Lincoln Avenue Water Company because it was  
3 small and you get kind of ignored and you get the short  
4 stick. And I have to say that I'm excited that we've  
5 moved along with Lincoln Avenue; however, when I hear  
6 their concerns I certainly hope that Pasadena gets  
7 better mitigation than Altadena and that somehow that's  
8 leveled out because Altadena does not have a simple  
9 government here. We have to rely on Mike Antonovich  
10 downtown and it's not -- we don't have a lot of input  
11 here. Regardless of how many meetings we talk, we don't  
12 have a lot of verbal clout. Pasadena does. So it seems  
13 to me only fair whatever they manage to muster that  
14 somehow some of that should be extended to Lincoln  
15 Avenue.

16 But besides that, what I was going to ask you is do  
17 you happen to know if Lincoln Avenue now is weighing a  
18 hundred percent of its pumping rights with this cleaning  
19 process or are they still below that or does anybody  
20 know?

21 MR. HAYWARD: Yes, we know.

22 MR. SLATEN: Bob, do you want me to answer?

23 MR. HAYWARD: Go ahead.

24 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. Lincoln Avenue Water Company has  
25 their own rights and about 500-acre feet per year.

1 They've been pumping all of that through this system in  
2 the last couple of years. In addition, the City of  
3 Pasadena has been, what's called, leasing them some of  
4 their water rights to pump for the city and give some of  
5 the water back to the city. So that system has been on  
6 most of the time since July of 2004.

7 MARIETTA KRUELLS: Okay. And then the final  
8 question is, as you say the plume is moving, will NASA  
9 at some point in this cleanup effort decide they've done  
10 all they're going to do? Is there -- what if there's  
11 something hidden we don't know about now? Let's say,  
12 you know, 20 years from now we find the plume moving  
13 faster than we were ever aware of and it overwhelms our  
14 systems again. Will the cleanup effort still be  
15 involved or is there some point in the plan to signing  
16 off?

17 MR. SLATEN: Okay. Kind of two questions, but I'll  
18 try to answer. There is an end to this. Some day when  
19 the water has been cleaned up enough to the levels that  
20 are set by the State and the EPA for clean water, then  
21 we'll be done and that's somewhere down the road, a  
22 decade or two perhaps down the road.

23 The other question is what if there's some other  
24 unforeseen thing lurking? We know a lot about the  
25 groundwater here. We have a lot of monitoring wells in

1 the ground to watch. So it's -- part of our job is to  
2 watch. I believe that we're getting close to having a  
3 holistic solution between these two off-site plants and  
4 the on-site plant that I think is going to take care of  
5 the whole problem. We'll be talking about that probably  
6 next year when we have every -- all the parts and pieces  
7 together.

8 MARIETTA KRUELLS: Actually, I mean, I understand  
9 your concerns in Pasadena. We share the concerns in  
10 Altadena. I have seen these people actually on board  
11 and it is something we didn't have quite a few years  
12 ago. So we couldn't use our water either and, you  
13 know -- following what they know now today and about  
14 before is that they are at least here and I do feel  
15 these two people will always listen, so I think you have  
16 a chance here, and good luck.

17 MS. FELLOWS: Elizabeth, I see you. We'll get to  
18 you in a minute, but there's two -- Annie is next.

19 ANNIE MORGAN-WILLIAMSON: I'm Annie Morgan-Williamson. My  
20 mother is Wilma Morgan. We live at 2663 Windsor which is directly  
21 in front of all this proposal. For instance, in January we  
22 had problems with bugs. We do have -- my parents bought  
23 the home in '74. We do own the soil. So underneath the  
24 house is the soil, but underneath the rest of the  
25 home -- the rest of our property is just the concrete.

1 We've had Termacon for 10 years. We've put regular  
2 tents on it. We have the house sprayed every three  
3 months. I talked -- we had a big gully in front right  
4 across the street which is where they have the plant now  
5 that they filled in since then about six months ago. We  
6 have -- our septic tank is in the front, so we've had a  
7 lot of problems with that, health problems with  
8 that issue. We didn't know if they were coming through  
9 the groundwater. They treated our soil. We've had  
10 Termacon for a decade. Our house is sprayed every other  
11 month.

12 They told -- we tried working -- we (inaudible)  
13 department of agriculture. I was curious as  
14 to -- although, you were saying I saw the plume  
15 saturated grounds and the other and I was curious as to  
16 what, if any, if that could be a problem with the soil  
17 with the bugs. Also as far as the property, the value  
18 of the property, we just had our house appraised within  
19 the last week and it's not the way it was. And his big  
20 question -- the appraiser's big question was what was  
21 going on across the street. And at that time of day  
22 when he was here there was pumping, they was doing this,  
23 they was doing that, there was rattling coming over  
24 across the street. Today one of the trucks left and in  
25 front of our fence right in front of the opening we had

1 a huge spool. And where did that come from?

2 Did you see it?

3 And another thing you were saying the front of our  
4 house is Altadena. Our address is Altadena but our  
5 utilities are Pasadena. So a lot of things that people  
6 get letters on Pasadena, they do not send us because our  
7 mailing address is Altadena but our utilities are paid  
8 in Pasadena.

9 I'm interested in also as far as the tanks and  
10 everything, we're not only looking out of our front  
11 window, we're looking out of our backyard and we're  
12 looking out two of our bedroom windows right directly  
13 across. And what happens when there's an earthquake?  
14 Are these things stable? Because otherwise Windsor --  
15 when we have had earthquakes, the streets have broken  
16 up. We've had some of the trucks hit our fence as  
17 they're coming out. We've had cars come through  
18 who -- during the rainy season the cars come through,  
19 right through the living room with all the additional  
20 traffic. So we're getting in a big mess. And I'm also  
21 in grief with it.

22 It seems like all the plans have already been made.  
23 And since our mail goes to Altadena, we don't know a lot  
24 of things about it. And I've called. I've asked  
25 questions. I've gone online. I've talked from the --

1 from Sacramento to the Department of Agriculture, and no  
2 one is telling us anything. And I am very concerned of  
3 persons in our neighborhood because a lot of them are  
4 not voicing anything. They are just voicing it in the  
5 street as we stand and talk in the cul-de-sac.

6 But if my property is going down, I wish we had  
7 known because we would have sold a couple of years ago.  
8 I mean, we could have made a cool \$900,000 or more  
9 because we live on a large sac. We are going to be  
10 looking at this thing for the rest of our lives. We're  
11 not happy. That's it.

12 I think we are voicing our opinion and I think it's  
13 a done deal. I hope we have some change. Unless, we're  
14 going to have (inaudible) like you suggested. Luckily  
15 he was putting things on the back of my -- on the back  
16 of our back door. So that we were -- we weren't even  
17 aware of the meeting. We just feel like we're left out  
18 of the loop because part of our house is in Altadena and  
19 part of it is in Pasadena.

20 MS. FELLOWS: We sent out 17,000 mailers to everyone  
21 from --

22 ANNIE: Oh, I got some of those.

23 SUE PICKER: Altadena didn't get them.

24 MS. FELLOWS: Do you live east of Lake?

25 SUE PICKER: No. I live directly north of Lake. I

1 live on Mountain View near the Arroyo.

2 MS. FELLOWS: Well, we need to talk --

3 SUE PICKER: I lived on (inaudible) Avenue, I got  
4 mail from (inaudible) Arroyo. None of my neighbors are  
5 here. I called some of them, and they didn't hear about  
6 it.

7 MS. FELLOWS: We'll get some --

8 ANNIE: There are a lot of people in that area that  
9 live directly across the street and right within not ten  
10 blocks away but three and four blocks away and they are  
11 not aware of what is going on.

12 TECUMSEH SHACKELFORD: Well, I put fliers completely  
13 from Mountain View from Lincoln all the way down to  
14 Windsor. I put fliers from Lincoln on Ventura and  
15 Ventura all the way down to his house. I put them all  
16 the way over your house, (inaudible.) So that's why we  
17 are here. But I put them there. I can't help it if you  
18 don't come. But I put them there for you.

19 MS. FELLOWS: Anybody who is here tonight that  
20 didn't get a mailer, please let us know so that --

21 MR. SLATEN: A mailer from -- a mailer from NASA.

22 ANNIE MORGAN-WILLIAMSON: I knew about it but I didn't get one.

23 MR. SLATEN: Do you have an example?

24 Everyone -- 17,000 of these went out. We want to  
25 make sure that everyone who's in this -- in Altadena



1 over here is on the mailing list. It's our

2 responsibility to make sure we give people the

3 opportunity to -- to comment.

4 SUE PICKER: I'm going to suggest that that's

5 probably not a really good form. I did get -- I thought

6 it came in the mail but I got something from

7 (inaudible.) People maybe don't look at that as knowing

8 that it is something pertaining to the neighborhood.

9 They look at it like --

10 MR. SLATEN: It's got my photograph right here.

11 MS. FELLOWS: That's great. And maybe -- if you

12 guys could be quiet because this is so important. Maybe

13 a postcard like we did for the health meeting that just

14 says, you know, "This is the meeting." We do put ads in

15 the paper and the Pasadena Star News and Pasadena Weekly but I

16 know a lot of you don't get it. And so that's a

17 great -- that's a great comment to really highlight

18 "this is coming soon to your neighborhood" or something.

19 This gentleman has been waiting a long time and then

20 Elizabeth, I promised her.

21 PAUL KASKIEWICZ: Paul Kaskiewicz, 320 Marathon Road,

22 Altadena. I would like to say that the (inaudible)

23 issues that we heard so much about tonight are very

24 important. But I feel personally that this plan that I

25 am holding that I picked up tonight (inaudible) has a

1 very inadequate discussion of the crucial issue of what  
2 the final levels of contaminants are going to be. And  
3 if I read this correctly there are words in here like  
4 "the preferred alternative." I mean there's not a  
5 written contract anywhere, I wouldn't sign that  
6 contract. "Would be to clean up the water to levels at  
7 the maximum contaminant levels." So we're going to end  
8 up sitting above water that is going to our drinking  
9 supply that's coming out of the maximum contaminant  
10 levels allowed by state and federal standards which -- I  
11 mean speaking for myself these are political  
12 compromises. If the city of Altadena wants clean water  
13 and I've heard that word "clean" tonight and yet I don't  
14 see anything in here about clean. In fact, the Bush  
15 Administration is busy pedaling away trying to increase  
16 these standards. And there's a sentence here that says  
17 that the "EPA" which we know is a mouth piece to the  
18 administration has recommended a preliminary remediation  
19 goal six times what the current state recommendation is.  
20 Now, I think there's not a fair and balanced  
21 discussion here. There are environmental action groups  
22 around the country that address this issue. There is  
23 roughly (inaudible) contaminant in California, Colorado,  
24 some in the east coast states where these department of  
25 defense sites have been doing this contamination for

1 half a century. And they -- you are sitting here

2 talking about addressing form issues and traffic and

3 noise but you are missing the nose of the camel. And

4 this report is woefully inadequate in what we are going

5 to end up with here in the water. Thank you.

6 MR. RIPPERDA: A couple of things on that. I'm from

7 the EPA. (Inaudible.) Yeah. I'll just (inaudible.)

8 ELIZABETH: I wanted to say something before you

9 started.

10 MR. RIPPERDA: Let's let Elizabeth say something.

11 MS. FELLOWS: Okay. Elizabeth has been waiting.

12 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: I would like to say that I think the

13 pumping plant should be on the JPL facility as was

14 suggested by the state. And also --

15 MS. FELLOWS: She is saying it should be on JPL.

16 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: JPL's facility. We have been

17 contaminated for years by JPL. Many of our neighbors

18 have died of cancer even though they brought in these

19 medical reports to say that it was not -- now we are

20 going to be a game there -- JPL's burden of putting in a

21 pumping plant right in the middle of our neighborhood.

22 We have an upscale neighborhood. It always has been and

23 we hope that it continues to be. Now I think that the

24 facility -- JPL has contaminated the area, they should

25 pay whatever the price is to put it where it will not

1 cause anymore burden to our community. We have carried  
2 this burden for a long time. So why should we carry  
3 another burden of JPL and Pasadena in order to cut cost?  
4 It can be done, but it cost too much. JPL has more  
5 money to throw away than to put a pump -- a pumping  
6 plant on its own facility.

7 Also, I would say that Pasadena does not care about  
8 Altadena residents, that I know. I have gone to the  
9 council for many things and they do not consider  
10 Altadena any consideration because we are not in  
11 Pasadena. But they have little plots here and there in  
12 Altadena and they are willing to put anything in our  
13 area and we cannot get nothing from Pasadena, no  
14 consideration in nothing. And I -- I have worked with  
15 them -- tried to work with them and this is a fact.

16 So I would suggest that environmental reports, all  
17 of this stuff should be gathered. And I know  
18 Pasadena will use their own staff environmentalists and  
19 they are going to say what Pasadena wants. It should be  
20 outside consultants. We don't want no inside  
21 consultants. And I think that it should not even be  
22 considered being put it in our neighborhood.

23 And I would like to get the federal and state  
24 representatives that we can write to as a community and  
25 let them know what is trying to be pushed on us.

1 JPL, we have been trying to get the traffic on  
2 Windsor cut down for over 20 years and it's more now  
3 than it ever was. And we are going -- right now we have  
4 gone to the traffic committee at town council, they  
5 can't do anything. I was thinking about coming to JPL  
6 and telling them to please tell the employees to give us  
7 a chance to even get out from our neighborhood. We sit  
8 there 15 and 20 minutes in the morning to get out onto  
9 Windsor. And we have one crosswalk from Ventura to  
10 Woodbury and it's a downgrade and they are going very  
11 fast.

12 We have a 24 hours job opening, they go in 24 hours  
13 around the clock. And now you're going to put something  
14 else out on Windsor. We won't even be able to -- this  
15 lady can't even look out her window, not only cross the  
16 street but get out with her car. So we got to petition.  
17 And I would like to get from you where we should write  
18 (inaudible) consultant. That's my suggestion. Put it  
19 on JPL facilities. They have made the problem, so why  
20 should we bear the burden. Thank you.

21 CHARLES HOPE: I live on Lehigh Street in Altadena.  
22 Why can't we have an on-site meeting on Sunday morning  
23 when all you guys find yourself (inaudible) who want to  
24 talk about it or --

25 MS. FELLOWS: We can do that.

1 CHARLES HOPE: Fine.

2 MS. FELLOWS: Other questions, comments? You  
3 started.

4 ALONZO EDWARDS: Where do we go from now? What are  
5 the next steps. I mean I saw the next steps that you  
6 have up. How long was that April 19th --

7 MS. FELLOWS: May 19th.

8 ALONZO EDWARDS: May 19th to get the public comments  
9 in?

10 MS. FELLOWS: Right.

11 ALONZO EDWARDS: And then after that where do we go?

12 Because I think -- let me back up. I think as I

13 understand it, in January NASA and the City of

14 Pasadena just came to an agreement on who is going to

15 bear the cost for all this or something like that. They

16 just came to an agreement. And now here we are four

17 months later -- five months later, and we're

18 already talking about a proposal. The point of it is

19 this is being shoved down this community's throat and we

20 want to know what other options or alternatives we have.

21 Like Ms. Francis said, and I agree with her, as I

22 mentioned before JPL caused this mess, let JPL put it on

23 the spotlight regardless of the cost. I mean they got

24 the money. You put folks on the moon, then they can put

25 them down on earth.

1 We really want to explore the other options. And  
2 these timelines can probably be extended because this  
3 community is really concerned about this and we really  
4 feel that these timelines are being crushed, being  
5 impacted on us and we're not sure what all the options  
6 are. Because when I asked initially what all other  
7 alternative proposals there were, there were none, this  
8 was it. This is like it's a done deal. And this may  
9 not be acceptable to this community. So if it isn't,  
10 what else can we do? I mean can we get an extension if  
11 we need to?

12 MS. FELLOWS: Yes.

13 ALONZO EDWARDS: Because this is just not acceptable  
14 to us, it really isn't.

15 MS. FELLOWS: We can definitely extend this. We can  
16 extend it -- I'll have to figure out what dates but we  
17 can send a postcard around to all 17,000 that says, you  
18 know, something more highlighted. And we'll put  
19 something in the paper. So we have officially extended  
20 the comment period. I'll let you know -- at least we'll  
21 do it in two weeks or something.

22 MR. RIPPERDA: I think the point is that extending  
23 the comment period like a couple weeks.

24 MS. FELLOWS: Well, I haven't finished.

25 MR. RIPPERDA: Oh, but you were extending the

1 comment period by a couple of weeks. But I think it's  
2 more than extending the whole process. Like right now  
3 the turn on date is January of 2008.

4 ALONZO EDWARDS: (Inaudible.) If you guys can agree  
5 that on January -- here you go rushing my opinions on a  
6 timeline like it's a done deal. This has been thrust  
7 upon us. We need to fully evaluate it. We need to feel  
8 comfortable that you guys are going to follow through on  
9 what you are going to do. Thus far, the City of  
10 Pasadena has not been really good neighbors to Altadena  
11 and JPL has caused the problem down there. You know,  
12 there are issues, there's a trust issue. And we are not  
13 comfortable with what we see so far today at all.

14 And so we want to know what other alternatives that  
15 we have. And I understand the cost thing. But they are  
16 right, you know. If you really wanted it, they could  
17 design some type of system back down there at JPL site  
18 somehow and clean it up down under. I don't care  
19 how -- like how narrow it is or what the issue is. It  
20 is your problem. You created it and this entire  
21 neighborhood is being impacted by it. And here we are  
22 bearing the burden to clean it up and we don't want to  
23 do that. We really don't. And we don't --

24 TECUMSEH SHACKELFORD: Steve -- go ahead.

25 ALONZO EDWARDS: So you're right. This compressed



1 timeline we have is just unacceptable to us at this  
2 point in time.

3 MS. FELLOWS: What I was thinking about was, you  
4 know, to me it is saying you should have a start in  
5 making a public comment just so we have a start and end  
6 to it. But we should do these (inaudible). We  
7 should build in a process where we have a lot more  
8 community involvement.

9 ALONZO EDWARDS: That's correct.

10 MS. FELLOWS: And -- and make it -- you know, I  
11 didn't think about the date a little more expansively  
12 than two weeks, I'm nervous up here. But we're  
13 definitely committing to work with you and not closing  
14 off, not having this next step in the process until we  
15 do meet with you guys a lot, whatever -- whatever it  
16 takes. We are hearing you tonight and --

17 TECUMSEH SHACKELFORD: And after you -- after we  
18 hear this, we have to go back in our community and meet  
19 and come up with some ideas and some things and then  
20 come back to you again. Because we're doing this but we  
21 need time to digest this in our community and see  
22 what -- how we are going to come up with some things and  
23 come back with feedback.

24 MS. FELLOWS: As you know, I did contact you  
25 early -- actually the end of March and offered so I know

1 you attend your meetings as well there, of course. But  
2 we're also willing to come talk and help find a meeting  
3 to talk about it. And any other groups that --

4 DEIRDRE WEST: One quick comment on that. Under the  
5 California Environmental Quality Act process which the  
6 City of Pasadena is going to go through, you have to  
7 present an alternative. And it has to be a feasible  
8 alternative and the fact that it's more expensive is not  
9 reason enough to not use or go in the direction of that  
10 alternative. I mean, unless they're going to try to get  
11 rid of this with a mitigated negative declaration, which I  
12 really hope, you know, it isn't. Because I see  
13 clearly that there is significant (inaudible) impacts to  
14 the community with this facility, which to me requires a  
15 full environmental impact report which requires an  
16 alternative analysis. So just as the project component,  
17 you're going to have to have another feasible  
18 alternative just to go through the CEQA process.

19 So maybe you ought to put a little more energy into  
20 that for the next community meeting that we have so we  
21 at least have something else to evaluate as opposed to,  
22 you know, "this is our project." That's why they call  
23 it "preferred alternative," you know, this is your  
24 preferred alternative. But what is the  
25 other alternative? So far, you know, I haven't really

1 heard one.

2 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: I have a question. Isn't Windsor on  
3 Altadena Road?

4 MS. FELLOWS: This way?

5 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: This is Windsor Reservoir and Altadena  
6 Road -- Pasadena doesn't own the road. Is it Pasadena  
7 or Altadena?

8 MS. FELLOWS: The road I think is half and half.

9 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: Half and half. And Pasadena is on what  
10 side -- side of (inaudible) house?

11 MS. FELLOWS: It's on the Windsor Reservoir side.

12 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: It's on the east side?

13 MS. FELLOWS: East side.

14 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: In the middle.

15 MR. SLATEN: What I -- what -- we had -- we had a  
16 long comment and I did want to go ahead and start  
17 answering the question a little bit. And when it  
18 stopped the preferred alternative and our proposed plan,  
19 we looked at several other options and we looked at what  
20 it would -- what was required to make a viable option  
21 and things that were needed to make it work, and the  
22 things in order to have a successful treatment plant,  
23 the things that you needed to have. So it's not as  
24 though we didn't -- we went through and screened and  
25 looked for the things that were viable options. We came

1 up with one proposed option which met the criteria to  
2 be a viable option.

3 So it's not as though there's no -- no process. And  
4 we -- we tried to describe that -- some of that in the  
5 proposed plan and looked at technologies. That makes a  
6 difference in the location as well and the available  
7 technologies. There's not that many of different  
8 available technologies that can do this and so how could  
9 they do it and where. And then we looked at potential  
10 locations.

11 So we have done a lot of that. We are trying to do  
12 our homework, we're trying to do it right. We also need  
13 it to be at a point where it's not a done deal but we've  
14 done enough of our homework. If we had come -- I'm  
15 afraid if we had come before we had done any of our  
16 homework and said we've got an idea about something,  
17 you'd say go away and think about what it is and come  
18 back and tell us. So we are kind of darned if we do and  
19 darned if we don't sometimes in these processes. We try  
20 to get it to the right process where we thought was  
21 (inaudible) enough and we're able to discuss it.

22 ALONZO EDWARDS: But you still didn't answer the  
23 question, though. There is no another viable  
24 alternative right now today. This is the only plan that  
25 you guys have right now to go with; am I correct?

1 MR. SLATEN: That's correct.

2 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: She stated that you have to have an  
3 alternative site in order to go through the process, so  
4 you're not going to work on that or are you just going  
5 to go with this one?

6 MR. SLATEN: You know, I think we'll answer that  
7 comment in writing because I don't -- I'm not sure I  
8 agree with the statement she made.

9 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: Oh. I got a question.

10 MR. SLATEN: I don't want to be combative.

11 DEIRDRE WEST: (Inaudible) alternative analysis.  
12 That would mean you have to have more than one  
13 alternative.

14 MS. CURRIE: (Inaudible.) Yeah. Because we're  
15 talking about two different processes. You're referring  
16 to the California Environmental Quality Act and that's  
17 what the city is going to conduct and we will identify  
18 the various options and talk about the pros and cons of  
19 each option and which one we think is the most feasible.

20 But what Steve is talking about is that NASA did a  
21 lot of work looking at how to do a treatment process and  
22 where to put it. And so for the purposes of this  
23 meeting what he is showing you is what you come down to  
24 saying this is the one that is most viable, that it's  
25 got issues, okay. And that's what we've got to deal

1 with is the issues. And see are they resolved? Okay.

2 Because what it's going to come down to at the end of  
3 the fight, we had all the discussions, is we're going to  
4 have to set choices. And those are the choices that the  
5 community is going to have to deal with.

6 ELIZABETH FRANCIS: Read off some choices.

7 MS. CURRIE: Well, because the -- first, you got the  
8 basic choice are we going to do the cleanup or not.  
9 Okay. I mean, all we've gotten to at this point is  
10 handing out a deal of who is paying for it, okay. Now  
11 we're down to -- they say the (inaudible) in the  
12 details, we're at the details, okay. And the details  
13 get into where you are going to put the treatment  
14 process, who's impacted. Can you mitigate the impacts  
15 of the satisfaction of the community, and if not, then  
16 what are we going to do, okay.

17 ALONZO EDWARDS: But the point I even have up there  
18 is why is the City of Pasadena involved right now? For  
19 instance, an alternative could be on La Canada's side  
20 and you wouldn't have to be involved whatsoever at all.

21 MS. CURRIE: Well, I have to be involved because I  
22 want to, okay. So I mean that's why I've been involved  
23 from the beginning. I'll be involved until the end,  
24 okay. It is our water and you are all paying your money  
25 because we can't use this water. Now that doesn't take

1 away from the issues that the people around this site  
2 have to deal with. So I am not trying to minimize your  
3 issues. I am just saying there is a variety of issues.  
4 And to me the best way is we all have to work together  
5 and see if we can come to an agreement that is  
6 acceptable. And you know, we started off -- we wanted  
7 it on their site because I didn't want to have to go to  
8 these meetings, okay. But that's not where we are.

9 ALONZO EDWARDS: That's the issue that we have,  
10 though. This -- why weren't we involved --

11 MS. CURRIE: Because we were only arguing about the  
12 money, okay. And we knew after that point we were going  
13 to have to sit down with the community and say can we  
14 come to an agreement about where to take it.

15 MS. FELLOWS: When she said (inaudible) how much it  
16 costs, she means who pays.

17 ALONZO EDWARDS: But see -- but the issue is, I hear  
18 what you are saying but I don't agree that this site is  
19 the best site. I really agree that JPL caused this  
20 mess, somehow JPL can fix it and I don't care what the  
21 costs are -- I don't know what your prices are, they  
22 knew this was coming up, this is a natural (inaudible.)

23 MS. CURRIE: Well, what I would say is we have to  
24 involve all of you with NASA and the City and the County  
25 and try to reach some conclusion. So I am not trying to

1 take away from what you're saying. I'm just saying that  
2 right now we start with a certain amount of information  
3 and facts and we have to focus on that, okay.

4 ALONZO EDWARDS: Let's go home.

5 VALERIE CAUDEL: I have one other question.

6 Why -- are you still continuing 15 to 25 of those tanks  
7 on that particular site? For the last meeting I have  
8 that that was what the proposal was that you were going  
9 to put 15 to 25 of those tanks on that lot.

10 MR. SLATEN: Yes. I still believe that's probably  
11 the correct range.

12 VALERIE CAUDEL: I don't see -- I just -- it just  
13 looks like it would be up to the fence. And, I mean, it  
14 just looks like it would take up that whole area.

15 MS. FELLOWS: That whole area pretty much --

16 VALERIE CAUDEL: And one other question. You said  
17 that they would change these filters once a month or  
18 however often. Does that mean that each filter in each  
19 one of those tanks would have to be changed or is it  
20 just one filter that's taking the quick process or does  
21 each tank have its own filter?

22 MR. SLATEN: There -- many of the tanks are in -- I  
23 don't want to say in series versus parallel. But  
24 there's a lead tank. The first one where the chemicals  
25 come to, that's the one that has to be changed first



1 because that's the one taking out the chemicals. And  
2 then there will be one behind it for safety and you try  
3 to get the first tank to where it's used up and then you  
4 can replace that one. So I am trying to answer the  
5 question.

6 They're not all -- you don't come in and every tank  
7 gets emptied at one time. It's usually just like the  
8 first one that -- that comes in. Lincoln Avenue Water  
9 Company has a similar system. It's called a "lead" and  
10 a "lag." There's a front tank where the water goes in  
11 first. That one usually lasts about six months or so.  
12 Bob?

13 MR. HAYWARD: Well, okay, you're talking about  
14 lead/lag filter. And we're talking about -- this is a  
15 dual treatment process where we're treating both VOCs  
16 and perchlorate. The technology available and the  
17 concentrations that we're dealing with dictates that the  
18 VOCs -- the media that we use to remove the VOCs, that  
19 media saturates a lot faster than media to use  
20 perchlorate. The system that Steve was referring to,  
21 the lead and lag system, we use that on the perchlorate  
22 system and we get as much as one year of use out of a  
23 vessel before that vessel has to be converted or the  
24 vessel has to be changed out. So that truck you said  
25 was going to be there every week, no.

1 As far as the VOCs are concerned, any of the  
2 concentration that is used in moving from the water will  
3 dictate the rate that saturates the media will determine  
4 the frequency of the media change out.

5 MR. SLATEN: I'm trying not to underestimate the  
6 number of trucks. And we don't -- since we don't know  
7 yet and there's different vendors that might have  
8 different systems that might last a different amount of  
9 time. There will be regular service trucks in there  
10 every few weeks, I think, a big truck will come in and  
11 put in fresh filter media in at least one of the tanks.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Many of the -- I'm  
13 (inaudible) Altadena.

14 MS. FELLOWS: If anyone (inaudible.)

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I understood that within the  
16 city and NASA -- NASA is paying for the expenses. Is  
17 there a budget? Do we know how much NASA is paying for  
18 it? Is there a max that they pay for the (inaudible)  
19 and what you're going to get? It's really about the  
20 money.

21 MR. SLATEN: No -- there's -- there's not a set max  
22 to be paid. We have the estimates that will cost  
23 perhaps about \$3 million dollars to get the system ready  
24 and about another \$3 million dollars a year to lease the  
25 system.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: For what you're proposing  
2 right now?

3 MR. SLATEN: Correct.

4 MS. FELLOWS: Before I lose more people, I would  
5 just like to say we've been talking about extending the  
6 comment period. And there are still important things.  
7 One is extending the comment period just because we want  
8 to be fair and make sure you have enough time to give  
9 input. But we also want to commit even longer to all  
10 these meetings and stuff and we'll continue those  
11 regardless of when the comment period ends.

12 So what I would like to do is extend it another 30  
13 days and I am only making this decision quickly so that  
14 you hear it here and hopefully the Star News will carry  
15 it in the paper tomorrow as well and get a jump start on  
16 continuing the comment period. So that's more or less  
17 June 19th. I'd rather look at the weekday and make sure  
18 it's not a Saturday or Sunday (inaudible.) So we'll  
19 check -- read the paper tomorrow. If somebody has a  
20 calendar we can figure it out right now.

21 MR. SLATEN: Or the next day.

22 MS. FELLOWS: And we're still going to have more  
23 cookies and discussion and displays out there.

24 So the 19th is a Monday, June 19th. Is that -- so  
25 then the public comment is officially extended until

1 June 19th. And we also -- we'll try to have like a  
2 meeting in there and we'll send out postcards when and  
3 where it will happen.

4 Tim, did you want to say something? You had your  
5 hand up a while ago.

6 TIM: I'm just (inaudible) and I've been kind of  
7 watching the situation for a long time. And I am  
8 a member of the board of directors of the Metropolitan  
9 Water District which is the one that sells all the water  
10 to Pasadena that they have to buy because they can't  
11 pump this water. So I have a certain interest in that.

12 But I want to put it in a bigger context because  
13 it's easy to say that, you know, JPL caused this problem  
14 and, you know, it's only JPL's problem. It isn't just  
15 JPL's problem. It's all of our problem. It's  
16 Pasadena's problem. It's Altadena's problems. It's all  
17 of our problems. And I know that there is a lot of  
18 history here and a lot of bad feeling and lack of trust  
19 about certain -- very legitimate issues and I want to be  
20 respectful of all the concerns that people have had and  
21 I hope that NASA and JPL and the City of Pasadena will  
22 be respectful of the concerns of what all the neighbors  
23 have raised here.

24 But I would just like to say that it's very  
25 difficult to get these problems solved. We've got a

1 massive problem there. We have a very serious problem  
2 of water contamination here, so much so that water you  
3 can't -- nobody can drink it. They've had to close  
4 those wells. Nobody is drinking that water. Those  
5 wells have been closed for what eight years now and some  
6 of them longer than that with treatment on it and the  
7 wells in Altadena are in the same situation. These are  
8 just more of Pasadena's wells. Pasadena also has five  
9 or six other wells that have also been closed; right?

10 So it's a very serious water supply problem and it's  
11 a very serious health problem that's got to be dealt  
12 with. So I would like to just -- you know, while  
13 recognizing the legitimacy of all of the neighbors'  
14 concerns that have been expressed here today is just say  
15 let's all work together to solve this problem so that we  
16 can clean this up and really, you know, make everything  
17 better here. And we're only going to do it by working  
18 together. So that's my plea.

19 MS. FELLOWS: All right. Is there any other -- yes,  
20 Paul.

21 PAUL KASKIEWICZ: Yes. I would like to see a process  
22 laid out where the community does get the stronger input  
23 in meetings like this. It seems like the government is  
24 responsible for this issue. NASA is a government  
25 agency. NASA is responsible for JPL. And NASA is

1 leading the proposed solutions. It seems there's a  
2 fundamental flaw in this structure here. And I am  
3 disappointed that tonight I don't see the City of  
4 Altadena having a stronger lead in this. It's very  
5 strange to me that I see the party that is responsible  
6 is also proposing solutions and presenting a limited set  
7 of options that are just focused on who knows what kind  
8 of constraints because we've just not the level of input  
9 and the awareness from the city and the residents here.

10 So I would like to see a very clear schedule and  
11 process for how that involvement by the residents and  
12 the City of Altadena is going to feed into this process  
13 from here on. And that's what I would like to see.

14 MS. FELLOWS: The gentleman over there that has  
15 spoken a couple -- next to Marietta.

16 Okay. Let me see. I have a couple of comments just  
17 to remind you that on May 7th are superseded by what we  
18 just did. Yep. I'm going to have you right into the  
19 comment period with responsiveness because you know that  
20 we will consider these comments.

21 Pretty much, it's all been superseded so still do  
22 get your comments in. Watch for our notice on the next  
23 meeting and if you can't come to that, you can call me  
24 any time if you have questions. If you have small  
25 groups you want us to come meet with, we'll come no

1 matter how small. No matter what we will come and meet  
2 with you wherever -- wherever you want and pretty much  
3 whatever, we can do it.

4 And thank you again for coming, for your attention  
5 and your thoughts and comments tonight. And --

6 SUSAN SANTOS: Just from someone who does a lot with  
7 the community (inaudible.) You need to think about what  
8 involvement looks like because who do you include and  
9 who do you exclude. So you want to try to bring a  
10 process of people who have a voice or have involvement.  
11 You also want to be able to do it in a way that will  
12 work and figure out who can -- are people committed to  
13 have some meetings and, you know, what do you -- what's  
14 that look like. So you may want to think about that --  
15 what's involvement look like as well in terms of that.

16 MARIETTA KRUELLS: I might suggest that you put  
17 banners along the reservoir announcing a meeting. I  
18 mean, it might look ugly for you for the moment but at  
19 least your neighbors will see it. And they can come to  
20 that site for that meeting and you won't be wondering,  
21 you know, well, how did we miss the meeting.

22 PAUL KASKIEWICZ: Well, Altadena is a huge area. I  
23 mean, a couple of banners by the reservoir is not --

24 MARIETTA KRUELLS: No. I'm just suggesting for  
25 your immediate concern of people that are going to have

1 to look at that, that's what I'm suggesting. As far as  
2 getting Altadena, you're going to have to rely on them  
3 to get a reply to Altadena. Altadena doesn't have a  
4 great system. You go to Altadena Council and you go to  
5 Altadena Land Use. They do publish it in the Star-News  
6 because I've seen it every day whether you think it was  
7 (inaudible) on it or not, I don't know. But I've seen  
8 it there. And I have lived here for 29 years, but it is  
9 hard to get Altadena there for anything, believe me.

10 MS. FELLOWS: Okay. Well, thanks again very much  
11 for coming. We'll be outside and in here to talk.

12 (At 8:51 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)

13 -oOo-

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA    )  
   ) ss.  
 2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES    )

3

4       I, the undersigned, hereby declare that said  
 5 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS was taken before me at the  
 6 time and place therein set forth and was taken down by  
 7 me in shorthand and transcribed into computer-generated  
 8 text under my direction and supervision; and I hereby  
 9 certify the foregoing transcript of my shorthand notes  
 10 so taken.

11       I further certify that I am neither counsel for  
 12 nor related to any party to said action nor in any  
 13 interest in the outcome thereof.

14       IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my  
 15 name this 16th day of May, 2006.

16

17

18

\_\_\_\_\_  
 CARRIE ANN PEREZ

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

